

Treaty and others (notably the Baltic nations) through their bravery and indomitable will. It should be added that some of the large autocratic nations suffered mutilation of their territory. The British Dominions and colonies acquired broader opportunities for home rule, and formed, with their mother country England, a commonwealth of nations.

The tendency for a time following the World War has been toward freedom and independence of subject nations, but the present attempt of European despots is to turn back the wheel of progress—back to the dark ages of the despots and robber barons.

Woodrow Wilson, that great American, in one of his public addresses during the World War, stated:

"Small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon. * * * Self-determination is not a mere phrase; it is an imperative principle of action which the statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril."

It is not conceivable that Denmark and Norway, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, whose inhabitants are among the leaders of the world in thought, courage, ability, and moral and spiritual worth, will remain in slavery under the heel of despots—whether foreign or native. The day must come when the peoples of small nations will enjoy all the liberties and opportunities for development and progress which they desire, and when their achievements will give to them a position of primacy among the nations of the world.

It is true that communism and nazi-ism, with their baleful and hateful ideologies, and fascism with its paucity of moral worth, still operate against small states and continue their oppressive policies, savagely assailing those nations which resist their demands.

The despots—Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini—claim high honor for themselves and their armies for overrunning and enslaving so many small nations. We all remember how Mussolini celebrated the conquest of Ethiopia and Albania by his legions, and what military honors he claimed for them. Stalin celebrated his victory over Finland and the Baltic States with great pomp in the Kremlin in Moscow, praising his soldiers as heroes and bestowing countless titles and privileges upon his army officers. Hitler has done even better; after each conquest he and his propaganda agents have called Germans lordly people and supermen.

After the World War, when the Baltic nations regained their freedom and independence, they began to be known the world over, in industries, international trade, at the Olympic games, in music and literature. Now, after their occupation by a million of the hungry soldiers of Stalin, they appear again to be lost. Not a news item, not a printed word comes out of these countries, save the Communistic sheets praising Stalin as a "demigod," so completely are the Baltic nations hidden in the darkness of Bolshevik oppressors.

The four nations herein referred to, after obtaining their independence following the World War, assumed their rightful place among the nations of the world. They discharged their national and international obligations and obtained the confidence and good will of all democratic and liberty-loving peoples. But the Bolshevik regime dominated by Stalin and his Communistic philosophy, made war upon each of these nations. Finland heroically defended herself against the cowardly and unprovoked assaults of her assailants. Lithuania for more than 22 years maintained her independence, but in June of this year the Bolshevik Government invaded Lithuania, and in violation of solemn treaties destroyed the Lithuanian Government and brought Lithuania and its more than 3,000,000 inhabitants under the cruel and despotic rule of the Bolshevik Government. Estonia and Latvia likewise have lost their independence, and the Bolshevik Government now imposes its iron rule upon them. The conduct of the Bolshevik Government with reference to these four nations calls for universal condemnation.

Certainly the day must come when the shackles of oppression which bind these states will be broken and their inhabitants again enjoy freedom. The Government of the United States has refused to recognize the cowardly aggressions of the Bolshevik regime, and the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State on the 25th of July this year stated:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—

in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

In conclusion, may I say that the day will come when tyrants and despots will fall. Then will these four nations assume their rightful place among the free peoples of the earth.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, December 26, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 23 (legislative day of November 19), 1940

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

Walter M. W. Splawn to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COLE of Maryland.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Light of love, unto Thee do we offer our praise and adoration. Thou who art the Bearer of the light of the world, let it shine forevermore. Today Thy holy benediction breathes sweetly and lovingly into sight amid storm and earthquake, wind and tide. O God, in triumphant faith would we sail the turbulent waters and with Thee, O Christ, climb the hills of difficulty. We humbly pray that the glory of the manger may shine forth; that our entire country may be the knight errant of the poor and that every little window may be radiant with the Christmas Star and all low rafters exalted as the angelic hosts hover near and sing their immortal song.

Behold, O Lord, how the earth doth lie in darkness and wickedness, reeling beneath the scourge of war. O Prophet of God, we urgently pray that its guise may fall and that the haggard monster may be realized as the dire enemy of man's soul. Oh, for Thy strong arm on which we may lean and a guide to throw light upon our pathway; clear our Father's face that it may be seen behind the darkest cloud. Comfort the sick and the sorrowing and bless them with Christmas cheer that all discords may be sweeter and happier in the spirit of the advent of our Lord and Saviour. May a new day of hope and cheer bring its benedictions to all the world. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 19, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4415. An act to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same and to provide for the punishment thereof," approved June 25, 1910.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. RANKIN administered the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore to Mr. COLE of Maryland.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PANDERING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4415) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same, and to provide for the punishment thereof," approved June 25, 1910.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say that this is a measure that was requested by the Attorney General and concurred in by the district attorney for the District of Columbia. After a study, and a review of certain cases that have arisen in the courts, they believe that our present pandering law, which was approved June 25, 1910, does not adequately cope with commercialized vice as it seems to exist in the District of Columbia at the present time. The measure came before the Senate on Thursday last and was passed by that body unanimously.

The bill has been before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and all members—the minority as well as the majority—have been polled and are in unanimous agreement that the legislation should be passed at this time. The bill has the support of the Attorney General, the district attorney for the District of Columbia, the Commissioners for the District of Columbia, and the District committees of both the Senate and the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same and to provide for the punishment thereof," approved June 25, 1910, is amended to read as follows:

"That any person who, within the District of Columbia, shall place or cause, induce, procure, or compel the placing of any female in the charge or custody of any other person, or in a house of prostitution, with intent that she shall engage in prostitution, or who shall compel, induce, entice, or procure or attempt to compel, induce, entice, or procure any female to reside with any other person for immoral purposes or for the purpose of prostitution, or who shall compel, induce, entice, or procure or attempt to compel, induce, entice, or procure any such female to reside or continue to reside in a house of prostitution, or compel, induce, entice, or procure or attempt to compel, induce, entice, or procure her to engage in prostitution, or who takes or detains a female against her will, with intent to compel her by force, threats, menace, or duress to marry him or to marry any other person; or any parent, guardian, or other person having legal custody of the person of a female, who consents to her taking or detention by any person, for the purpose of prostitution or sexual intercourse, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and by a fine of not more than \$1,000."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, by threats or duress, detains any female against her will, for the purpose of prostitution or sexual intercourse, or any person who shall compel any female, against her will, to reside with him or with any other person for the purposes of prostitution or sexual intercourse, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and a fine of not more than \$1,000."

Sec. 3. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, shall receive any money or other valuable thing for or on account of arranging for or causing any female to have sexual intercourse with any other person or to engage in prostitution, debauchery, or any other immoral act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and a fine of not more than \$1,000."

Sec. 4. Such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 6. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, shall pay or receive any money or other valuable thing for or on account of the procuring for, or placing in, a house of prostitution, for purposes of sexual intercourse, prostitution, debauchery, or other immoral act, any female, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and by a fine of not more than \$1,000."

"Sec. 7. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, shall receive any money or other valuable thing for or on account of procuring and placing in the charge or custody of another person for sexual intercourse, prostitution, debauchery, or other immoral purposes any female shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and by a fine of not more than \$1,000."

"Sec. 8. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, knowingly, shall accept, receive, levy, or appropriate any money or other valuable thing, without consideration other than the furnishing of a place for prostitution or the servicing of a place for prostitution, from the proceeds or earnings of any female engaged in prostitution shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years and by a fine of not more than \$1,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by George D. Riley, U. S. and U.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, actually, just what is our state of national defense? I have introduced a number of privileged resolutions to ascertain those facts, but to no avail. Today it is generally admitted by the administration, and by able Mr. Knudsen, and others in charge of national defense that there has been a woeful failure and that we are not prepared, that our defense is not going forward. It seems to me, and I believe my colleagues will agree with me, that it is not efficient or intelligent, especially when speed is of the essence, to build new plants that would take a year or longer to build and equip, and where labor would have to be trained, when we have in my own locality and in the districts of others of our colleagues vacant plants, and some plants already in operation seeking orders, with machines and highly trained labor available. Many times I have brought these facts to the attention of those in charge of national defense. I earnestly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will join with me when I again beg the Defense Commission to start these plants in operation in order that our defense measures may not be just on paper, but that we may actually have production immediately. America must wake up. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Colonel Fleming, of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Colonel Maxwell last Thursday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business on today's calendar has been completed I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit four unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Franklin J. Anderson, of the Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Second, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from myself to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Third, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. Fred L. Thurston, executive secretary of the California Teachers' Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from Irving Mumford, State commander of the American Legion in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including some remarks by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Winston Churchill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes after other business has been disposed of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, and Mr. MICHENER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to reply to the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] with reference to our national-defense program.

Of course, we are going forward as rapidly as possible, but I think it would be a sad mistake to concentrate all these defense industries into New England or into any other congested section of the country. That is one of the troubles England is having today. Her war industries are concentrated into a few large cities which make the convenient targets for bombing raids. If we are going to prepare our country and keep her prepared to defend herself, these industries ought to be decentralized in order not only to make them safer from attack but in order to protect every section of the country as we go. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. MICHENER. The question is this, Does the gentleman not think that the question of national defense should be left to the National Defense Board and that the Members of Congress from all sections of the country should not be endeavoring to prevail upon the members of the Board or urging them to establish the defense units in the various sections?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not think Congress ought to abdicate at all. I think Members of Congress ought to keep in mind the fact that we represent all the American people and the whole of the American Republic. I think every Member of this Congress is more familiar with his section of the country than is someone from some other section who may be appointed on a board and who has never been within a thousand miles of where that Member lives. [Applause.]

Of course, at the present time a large percentage of these plants are situated in the States of Michigan and Massachusetts, where large numbers of men are employed and large pay rolls are maintained. But there is absolutely no reason on earth for further concentrating these defense industries in those States to the exclusion of the rest of the country.

These activities should be decentralized as far as possible to maintain the highest degree of efficiency and effectiveness.

As President Roosevelt pointed out some time ago, the ideal location for industries of this kind is between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains, where they will be protected from the sea, and where there is an abundance of raw materials, adequate transportation facilities, an ample supply of labor, and unlimited amounts of cheap electric energy.

Then, too, the South and West must be protected as well as the North Central and the New England States. Remember that it is absolutely essential to protect the Gulf States against attacks from air bases in the Caribbean, or from airplane carriers in the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, or the South Atlantic Ocean, or from land bases in Central and South America.

Remember also that it is just as necessary to be ready to defend the Western States, and especially the Pacific Coast States, as it is to protect the Atlantic seaboard or any other section of the country.

These plants can be scattered throughout the South and West in such a way as to save the Government hundreds of millions of dollars in the transportation of raw materials alone.

Besides, economic conditions in the agricultural States are such as to render it necessary that they be given their pro

rata share of these defense industries wherever that can be done without detriment to the Federal Government or without impairing or slowing down the defense program. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain tables which I have prepared.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE C. I. O

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in following the news items, I have noted that Mr. Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., has a long list of ideas and suggestions as to how the national-defense program may be carried out. In addition to this, I note he has made the statement that the C. I. O. has been and will be thoroughly cooperative with the Government in carrying forward the program of national defense.

There is no question but that this matter of cooperation on the part of the C. I. O. would be very helpful in carrying forward the national-defense program if it were sincerely put into effect, and if this country could count upon it. If this can actually, truly, and faithfully be put into effect, and if the first consideration in the policy of the C. I. O. could be adopted, namely, the welfare and safety of this Nation above all else, then it appears that Mr. Murray could use his influence to submerge the lust for power of the C. I. O. to control N. L. R. B., its lust for power to control the national-defense program, and bury whatever personal ambitions he and other leaders of the C. I. O. may have, for the sake of the Nation. If he does not submerge any such ideas and bury these ambitions, in the long run the C. I. O. and all other labor is going to be the greatest loser, because, under communism, nazi-ism, or fascism, all labor would be reduced to serfdom. The great masses of the people of the United States have been hoping that Mr. Murray and all these leaders in C. I. O. could see this. The words of Mr. Murray sound very nice, but the actions of certain of these C. I. O. leaders in the past do not check out with any such words.

It is my opinion that confidence in the C. I. O. has been lost, by the great mass of the people in this country, due to their past actions. Our people are not going to give that confidence back on account of a few words that may be spoken or written, because the result, or the outcome, is going to have too serious an effect upon the Nation. I, like many millions of our people, have come to this conclusion on account of certain things that have happened and which Mr. Murray and his leaders cannot deny, and they will have to answer this question, Do Mr. Murray and his other leaders think that they have contributed toward the advancement of the national-defense program by actually calling and threatening strikes in the forest lumber camps, in the sawmills, in the transportation divisions, in the shipping, in the shipbuilding, in automobiles, in the airplane works, in the steel industry, in the aluminum, and many other industries? If they do think so, it is time Mr. Murray realized, and he is now being told, that millions of the people in this country do not think so, but, on the contrary, they think that Mr. Murray and his leaders' statements are lip service only; that they are not sincere in their stated desire for advancement of this national-defense program. These same people feel, and it is due to past actions on the part of the C. I. O. and their leaders, that their real motive is to further entrench themselves in the power to control N. L. R. B., national defense, industry, and finally the Government itself.

Inasmuch as that is the situation, these millions of people have lost confidence in the C. I. O. and its leadership, and these same leaders of the C. I. O. should step out of this picture and not try to continue to dominate it. If they are

sincere, they will recede from this dominating position and get back to work and start to produce, quit calling strikes, quit threatening strikes, and quit trying to put themselves into a dominating position in the crisis we are now in. It is time that the C. I. O. leadership began to realize that they cannot take advantage of a crisis such as this to exact from the United States Government, through its defense program, tremendous amounts of money that will run the cost up so high that the Government will not be able to get the numbers of units that are called for in their program. It is time they realize that industry has had to submit to excess-profits taxes and that industry has willingly accepted what may be termed a "limited profit" in this program.

The people of this country are not going to see the C. I. O. labor leaders dictate the policy of the country. The C. I. O. are in the minority, and no one knows better than they, that they are in the minority; and in this country it was never contemplated that the minority should rule. They should begin to realize that this country should be run for the benefit of the great majority.

If the C. I. O. leadership actually wanted to make a real contribution, the best way they could do this would be to attend to their own business, namely, to take care of the unscrupulous, racketeering labor leaders within their own ranks; to recede from their position of trying to dictate the national policy; to cease to try dictating to which concerns orders for national defense are to be given; and last, but most necessary of all, to see that their men deliver a real day's work or value received for that for which they are now being paid.

On every hand we hear of the sacrifice that every individual, whether he is in industry or labor or private life, should make. It is high time that Mr. Hillman, Mr. Murray, and all of these other leaders recognize that they have some sacrifices that they must make and that this country is not going to stand for the idea that every individual in the country will make sacrifices and that these C. I. O. labor leaders shall be allowed to continue to feather their own nests.

Mr. Murray should also realize that the real Americans in this country, not only now but long have resented the dictates of Europeans and other foreign-born coming into this country and bringing with them the ideals of Europe and substituting them for the ideals of America. If Mr. Hillman, Mr. Murray, and the other labor leaders do not realize this, they may be sure that the American people are going to finally tell them that the people who came to the United States came here in order to get away from and avoid European principles and adopted what are known as American principles, and if these European and foreign-born leaders do not like the American principles, they must realize that nobody in this country sent for them, and the best suggestion is that if they do not like our principles and like those of Europe and other foreign countries better, the best thing that they can do is to go back to Europe or other foreign countries before this Nation becomes so aroused it will forcefully send them back or put them in places where they can no longer destroy American ideals. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the work of the Committee on un-American Activities, certain testimony was taken and some evidence presented which indicated the strong possibility that acts of sabotage might have been committed in certain plants in the country. This evidence was submitted to the Department of Justice and after they had had opportunity to study it, the Attorney General advised that, as a matter of fact, if an act of sabotage were committed in an American plant, but if it were directed against an article such as an airplane which had been ordered by some other government besides the American Government, the Department of Justice did not have jurisdiction; that it was a matter for State law-enforcing agencies to take care of.

As a result of this advice I sought the best help I could get and have today introduced a bill, the intent and purpose of

which is, briefly, the following: To give to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice the same jurisdiction in dealing with acts of sabotage, if committed against an article intended for exportation for the use of any government of a foreign country with which the United States is at peace, as it would have if that article were intended for use by the United States Government.

This bill has been drafted with the view of not changing any of the penalties existing in present law for like offenses and with a view to making only that one change.

Some of the drafts of this proposed bill that have been worked on would, in my judgment, have broadened too much and to too great an extent, the scope of action of the Federal Department of Justice, for they might have, in fact, given it the responsibility of investigating any matter where damage had occurred to any article intended for export to any person. I do not think that the Department would want that. I am convinced they would not, and neither do I want to see us make the mistake of setting up a national police force here. I do not think they are equipped to take care of it, and it is not the point we are trying to reach.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that the President's leasing and mortgaging plans goes through, is it not true that, if that were the situation, then the present law would be ample, because the present law takes care of any article which is to be used in our national defense? Under the leasing program, the presumption is that the Government is to do all of the ordering, and after the Government has secured this material it is to allocate it as the President may see fit to the several nations throughout the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman, first, that he is a member of the Judiciary Committee, and that I certainly have no intention of taking any action on a matter as important and vital as this, trying to get it passed, until after the Judiciary Committee has had occasion to consider it very, very fully; that it is much too important for me to want any other course to be followed than that. I was anxious, because of what I have been trying to do in order to contribute what I can to the coordination of these efforts between the various agencies working in this general field, to follow up as rapidly as I might the suggestion of the Attorney General. That is the reason why I was at some concern about introducing the bill as quickly as I could. But I want the bill to be considered, if possible, with full hearings by the Judiciary Committee. Certainly, for example, I would want representatives of labor to be heard concerning it.

Secondly, I would say that my principal interest in this matter is the following: It appears to me that if an airplane company, for example, is manufacturing planes for both the United States and some other nation, it is to our concern to see that nothing goes wrong in that plant at all. It seems to me to be rather a hair-line distinction to say that if an act is committed against plane A we do not have jurisdiction for the Federal department and if it is committed against plane B that we do have jurisdiction.

In further and more specific answer to the gentleman I would say that no matter what happens to this proposal of the President, certain foreign governments do have very substantial orders already placed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if in preparation of that bill the gentleman took into consideration the principles laid down in a bill which I introduced about 2 weeks ago for the same purpose. That bill meets the question by making sabotage unlawful with respect to all goods being manufactured which come within the President's proclamation under the Neutrality Act defining munitions. I think the gentleman will find that that covers it pretty well, and that provision was drafted carefully.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would that include goods on order from a foreign government?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; if they are defined by the President in that proclamation. If you will look at that proclamation you will find it covered pretty much everything that would be required for export purposes in connection with the war.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that it does not matter to me how this is gotten at. I do feel that it is very important to make plain in that legislation that this has to be a willful act of sabotage. In other words, I am deeply concerned that it should not be used as a means of imposing upon labor the possibility of unfair decisions which would put an accidental occurrence in the course of a labor dispute, for example, in the category of sabotage when it does not belong there at all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wanted to invite the gentleman's attention to that approach to the problem. I am in full sympathy with what the gentleman is seeking to do.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman attempt to define slowing down or a strike of any character as sabotage?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; because if the gentleman attempts to do that he would also have in fairness to define willful refusal on the part of a corporation to speedily take up a Government order as sabotage, and I am pretty sure the gentleman does not know how you can frame a piece of legislation to cover those things. I am inclined to think that they are problems that have to be worked out in the way the American Nation has always worked them out—by creation of a public opinion in which those things do not happen. In fact, that is the democratic approach to it.

Now, I want to proceed briefly with some matters that seem to be related.

I take it that the Members of the House, as well as other earnest Americans, are concerned that acts of sabotage do not take place. I think that the law on those matters and any other matter that is connected with disloyalty has got to be as specifically and carefully drawn as we can make it. I think that all of us are conscious of the fact that democracy in this tragic world is in a position where its very survival may well depend upon how the American people and their Government conduct themselves in the days that lie immediately ahead of us. Under those circumstances there is nothing that we should not attempt to do to encourage an orderly and vigorous program of arming for defense our Nation to the very best of our ability.

We have pursued certain policies with regard to our foreign affairs—policies of aid to certain democratic nations from which obviously we cannot turn back, and from which I take it we are not going to turn back, no matter what mean things may be said about us. But my main concern with this particular matter is to protect against any possibility of damage the American defense program itself.

Now I have introduced another bill. I did it not very long ago, and I mention it at this time only by way of illustration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I merely want to illustrate the point of this matter, not to make an argument for this bill, because in the case of the second bill I am not sure that it is properly drawn; in fact, I introduced the bill by request.

What the bill does, very briefly, is, having granted \$100,000 complete exemption, it states that deductions from gross income of corporations of over \$100,000 spent for advertising shall not be allowed in computing income taxes. Now, I

have received a lot of criticism because of this bill. In spite of the fact that we allow no deductions for wages paid or materials bought or anything of that sort, I seem to have committed some unpardonable crime by suggesting that there ought to be a limit to deductions for advertising expense. Oh, what a terrible idea to suggest.

I merely want to say this much about it: That inevitably the Congress is going to have to increase the tax rates. We know that the American people want the Congress to show them just exactly what the price is going to be of this program for defense and other things that they feel we have got to have. If we are going to do that, there ought not to be one single solitary loophole in our tax laws or any place where the incidence of the tax laws is going to fall with greater weight on one group of businesses than on another, or give to a great corporation able to spend huge sums on national advertising a distinct advantage over the small corporation that cannot possibly afford it. And so it seems to me that while people are expressing very great interest in legislation having to do with sabotage and matters of that kind we have also got to realize that it is equally important that people should be made to realize their responsibility of making their fair and just contribution to the national efforts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The statement has been made that some corporations, when their surplus reaches a certain point, knowing that the greater part will necessarily be paid to the Government as a result of the tax laws, have gone out and increased the amount they spend for advertising with a view to using that money for advertising purposes rather than paying it to the Government. This, in my opinion, is unfair and should be looked into by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is exactly the purpose of the bill, and that has even happened where the result of the advertising was not expected necessarily to increase their business. In its issue of November 18 Time magazine called attention to this matter. But my point is, and the only reason I introduced the bill was, to bring that matter before the attention of the people in order that it might properly be considered. I have no notion that my bill will be passed, but I do think it is important for this matter to be considered, and in the same light and with the same general patriotic viewpoint that we consider these other things. One more thought and I am through.

The President a short time ago suggested that in the case of dealing with Great Britain we should bring about a method of dealing on the basis that we would furnish aid to Great Britain and that it might be paid back in the same kind of things. Would it not be a great thing if the American farmer, for example, could, when he borrowed money equivalent to a thousand bushels of wheat or 500 boxes of oranges, be perfectly certain that he could pay back his debt in the same number of dollars equivalent exactly to a thousand bushels of wheat or 500 boxes of oranges? [Applause.] I look forward to the time, Mr. Speaker, when we may have a program in the monetary field which will give us that kind of dollar.

And I want to say this one thing further: That in my judgment the democracies of the world, and particularly the American democracy, holds within its own power the future of democracy in our country and maybe in the world. For the issue, after all, sums itself up as a struggle between two organizing principles of human life and government for the allegiance of peoples throughout the world. I believe that the future success of the democratic principle is going to depend in large measure on whether or not we give indication day by day and month by month that people who embrace the democratic system can look forward to a day and future when living will be more equal, when the burdens will be more fairly imposed, when all youth will have a greater opportunity to look forward to better days, and when as a matter of fact that essential balance between the power of a great nation to produce and its power to consume will be brought about by the application of wisdom and courage to the domestic prob-

lems of our Nation by responsible people like yourself and myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; because I am through.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not he is doing anything so that the farmer can get 25 cents, for example, for his products?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman pardon me a minute? I promised to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman speaks about subjects that are partially related to the bill under consideration. He speaks about the health of this country and its individuals to Great Britain. Would he venture an opinion as to the change of heart of Henry Ford when a few weeks ago he refused to make airplane engines that would go to Great Britain, and now he says, "Give them the money; do not lend it to them"?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I can understand the point of view of people who feel that to give this help would be preferable to lending it. I think I can understand why they might feel that might be less dangerous from the standpoint of future difficulties for the United States. Many people are seeing things differently from what they did awhile ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman refers to Henry Ford. Is it not possible that Henry Ford was thinking of America first when he was talking about making materials or airplane engines for America and not for Great Britain?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman that his colleague from West Virginia was the one who introduced Mr. Ford into this picture. My remarks were on another subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is the question I wanted to ask you awhile ago. What remedy does the gentleman have in mind which would give the farmer say 25 cents an hour for his work while he is forced to pay \$1 or \$1.10 an hour for the common labor that goes into the things he must purchase?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand the gentleman's question very well, if he wants me to answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I certainly do or I would not have asked it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would need a half hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am willing that the gentleman have a half hour up in the office.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say that agriculture is a competitive industry. Most of the things that the farmer buys comes from monopoly industries where the price is determined by the seller. The farmer by and large cannot determine his prices.

Now, I have not fully answered the gentleman, although I shall be glad to answer the gentleman at some other time when I have the time to do a job. I have a lot of ideas on the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, along the line the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] was speaking, may I say that I have seen a copy of his bill printed in the press and I also read a copy over on the desk; but his bill is limited to interference with exportation only. He has not said anything about production. How did that happen?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is involved. I may say to the gentleman that this bill has been drawn as nearly as possible to conform with the law with regard to sabotage against our own production and certainly sabotage of production is included under the terms of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. But I do not think it is. I ask the Members who are present to read the bill and see whether they can find one single word in it that prevents interference with production or prevents interference with anything except exportation. To my mind it is just as important that we have the opportunity to produce for national

defense as it is that we have opportunity to produce for exportation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The Congress has already passed an act having to do with the sabotage of American defense materials. You do not need a bill for that purpose. It is already within the purview of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we have a bill which prevents interference with production, all production, that would cover it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But it does not cover all production.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I notice the gentleman's bill only goes to exportation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I mean the present law does not cover all production. My bill would cover it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Attorney General told us that these strikes were being instigated by Communists but that there was no law on the books to reach them. I do not think the bill offered by the gentleman even deals with production—it deals with exportation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a false impression that has gone out in Michigan through some newspapers which published under a Washington date line dispatches stating that a Member from Michigan, from the Fourth Congressional District, prevented the adjournment of Congress. This seemed to me to be a strange thing, because we have 435 Members of Congress, and I could not understand how, under a representative republican form of government, one person out of 435 could prevent an adjournment. So I got out both rule books that we have here and I spent quite a little time looking through them. The best I could find was that any time a majority of Congress wanted to adjourn it might do so, and that even a minority could adjourn any time it had the votes on the floor to do so. Of course, I learned that if we wanted to adjourn finally it had to be by a concurrent resolution of both the House and Senate. That took me back to the thought that it should not be the part of any one Member to usurp the functions of the Congress and prevent it from adjourning when it wanted to, or whenever a majority of the minority wanted to do so, or, I mean, a majority of those present, even though it be less than a quorum.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not just now, because this is very important.

So I looked in another book, and I learned that the Democrats had almost a two-thirds majority in the Senate and had almost a hundred majority in the House. I reached the conclusion, after a great deal of study, that the majority party, if they really wanted to adjourn, could do so at any time finally, or just from day to day.

Then I wondered, but not very long, because I knew that the majority party had the utmost confidence in their President—someone suggested that maybe they did not have confidence in him and did not want to go away and leave him alone here in Washington without their supervision, but I recalled that it was a "rubber stamp" Congress and had been so for 6 or 7 years, and that they did just the things he wanted to, so the conclusion came that it must be that he really wanted Congress to stay here, because if he did not, the majority would have adjourned.

Then the dispatch, I noticed, carried the statement that the Speaker suggested that just one Republican had kept this House from adjourning, and that after doing that he had, so to speak, "run out" on the House. Though the dispatch referred to me—and I have objected to adjournments—I never ran away from anything; in fact, have attended every session of the House for months and since the middle of November have spoken on the floor almost every day in favor of defense legislation.

I want always, if I can, as difficult as it may seem to some of you, to be helpful to the majority party, not that they need any assistance about any of these things—not at all—and undoubtedly it is presumptuous on my part even to suggest anything as to what they can do or might do if they so desired. Nevertheless, having that desire to be helpful, I have prepared a concurrent resolution against which I will vote if a vote be had. I send it to the Clerk's desk, so if the

majority party wants to adjourn here in the House and over in the Senate they can do so in spite of what any Republican says or does. I ask the Clerk to read the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A previous resolution is out, if the Speaker please.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman did not ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I asked for its consideration. I ask that it be read, anyway. If you want to take time to think it over, it is all right with me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 95

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Tuesday, the 24th day of December 1940, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable JOSHUA L. JOHNS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier and to include in my remarks I am about to make an article from the Washington Post of yesterday entitled "Machine-Tool Bottleneck Is Acute Problem," by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, also an article appearing in the Boston Traveler which was sent to me recently, together with an article appearing in the Boston Traveler on January 16, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the inclusion in my remarks of the article appearing in the Boston Traveler in 1929, which speaks of an educational-order bill which I introduced first in 1926 and another one which I introduced in 1929. The article is headed "Victory in Sight for War Measure of Mrs. Rogers." It ought to have been headed "Victory in Sight for National-Defense Measure of Mrs. ROGERS."

Unfortunately, that measure did not pass the House and it was a good many years before educational orders were appropriated for in order that this country might have the necessary machine tools and the skilled workers to bring about complete production in case of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to remind the House that this is the only large country in the world today that can observe the beautiful day of Christmas, the birth of Christ, with any degree of happiness or with any demonstration of beautiful lights and fine celebrations. But in the minds and hearts of every one of us in the United States there will be a dread that this country may not be adequately prepared. I earnestly pray for speed, more speed, and still more speed in our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you and everyone here a very merry Christmas and all that it means. [Applause.]

The article from the Boston Traveler of March 19, 1929, and the article from Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner from the Washington Post of December 22, 1940, follow:

[From the Boston Traveler of January 16, 1929]

VICTORY IN SIGHT FOR WAR MEASURE OF MRS. ROGERS—FAVORABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION PREDICTED ON BILL KNOWN AS EDUCATIONAL ORDERS BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON, January 16, 1929.—Favorable action by Congress now seems likely on the bill which has been under intensive study by the House Military Affairs Committee, for which Congresswoman EDITH N. ROGERS of Massachusetts has been persistently fighting for the last 3 years, known as educational orders by the War Department, which is urged by the War Department as an important national-defense measure and which would be a boon to many New England industrial plants.

HAS BIG BACKING

During the hearings which have just been conducted by the House Military Affairs Committee, Mrs. ROGERS' proposal, first introduced in 1926, has been supported by representatives of the largest manufacturing associations and establishments in the country and by the National Chamber of Commerce.

So impressed has the House committee become, following the testimony of War Department experts, and the assurance that the Budget Bureau does not find the plan in conflict with the financial program of the President, that Mrs. ROGERS' original proposition has been adopted as a committee measure and is fathered by Chairman MORIN, which assures its prompt passage as soon as it is brought before the House for action.

AMENDS DEFENSE ACT

This is an amendment to the National Defense Act authorizing the Secretary of War to place educational orders for equipment, munitions, and accessories needed in the military service with commercial concerns to the degree that is considered by him as being necessary to familiarize commercial factories with the manufacture of munitions and to advance the industrial war plans of the War Department. In placing these educational orders the competitive bids which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, best secure these results may be accepted, and he is to make statement of his action under this provision in his annual report.

It has been emphasized at the hearings that in time of war the arsenals manufacture but a very small fraction of the supplies and munitions that are needed. In wartime the Government has to draw upon industry and to draw upon all the industrial establishments throughout the country. In order that these industrial plants may know how to manufacture for the Government urgent need at that time, may develop skilled operatives, and have installed requisite machinery, these "educational orders" during peacetime are recommended by the War Department.

TWO-YEAR PROGRAM

Congresswoman ROGERS has brought to the attention of the House committee that other countries are doing a great deal along this line.

In consequence the committee is now considering a 2-year program.

Mrs. ROGERS has also emphasized that this is not a draft measure. The industrial plants are not to be drafted. She has been studying the problem closely for 12 years, since in 1917 she saw the spectacle of unpreparedness, when she found out in France that we did not have a single airplane in 1917 and did not use any of our airplanes during the war.

What made her introduce this bill in the beginning was that the United States Cartridge Shop was taken away from Lowell, and in going over the facts she learned that the War Department very much needed the United States Cartridge Shop, and that over 700 splendidly trained workmen were thrown out of employment. The location of the plant in Lowell was excellent, having the very desirable advantage of being inland.

MUST HAVE AMMUNITION

Congresswoman ROGERS reminded the committee that "a fighting army expends ammunition each day of warfare. The supply must come from factories or from reserve stocks. This ammunition is not commercial and the factories are not regular peacetime producers. During the time their production is being built up, reserve stocks must be available to be drawn upon. The longer it takes to build up the necessary production the greater the initial reserve must be. The alternative of a slackened rate of fire means a greatly increased death rate and possible defeat. The British Army experienced the former in averting defeat in Flanders while waiting for high explosive shell production and barely avoided defeat even with the enormous loss of men accepted."

POINTS STRESSED

In summarizing the War Department's interest, Congresswoman ROGERS presented to the House committee a statement that showed the passage of her bill is desired to further industrial preparedness for war, with the following points stressed:

1. Modern war is a war of machines.
2. Modern war requires these machines in numbers heretofore undreamed of.
3. The capacity of Government arsenals for the manufacture of these machines is small compared with the volume required.
4. The industry of the country must make up the deficiency.
5. Modern industry is not familiar in time of peace with munitions manufacture.

6. Without this familiarity valuable time is lost when emergency arises.

7. Much of the valuable time can be saved by placing educational orders for munitions with commercial concerns.

8. The placing of these educational orders will unquestionably add to national preparedness.

9. The slight increased cost is cheap national insurance.

10. The placing of these educational orders is not possible under existing law.

SUGGESTED BY JOHN W. WEEKS

Congresswoman ROGERS has also brought to the committee's attention that the late Secretary of War John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts, back in December 1922, recommended to Congress such a procedure, saying the distribution of these educational orders should be such as to give some experience to as many different plants as conditions permit. At that time he advocated an appropriation of \$3,000,000 to start this scheme.

[From the Washington Post of December 22, 1940]

MACHINE-TOOL BOTTLENECK IS ACUTE PROBLEM

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

As everyone knows, a shortage of machine tools is the primary bottleneck in the defense program. The problem is so acute that last week Defense Commissioner William S. Knudsen sent a circular letter to the Nation's machine-tool manufacturers, pleading with them to redouble their efforts to expedite deliveries and expand production. Unfortunately, few competent authorities hope the machine-tool bottleneck can be reamed out by simple patriotic enthusiasm. The real difficulty arises not from lack of enthusiasm but from lack of foresighted planning. Until that kind of planning is attempted—and it probably cannot be attempted until the present defense set-up is reorganized—improvements in machine-tool output seem likely to be superficial.

The story of the machine-tool bottleneck is fairly simple. The defense program called for a vast expansion of industrial production. The basic problem was not placing orders for finished goods but obtaining facilities to make the finished goods. Of these facilities, machine tools were both the most important and the most difficult to prepare speedily in large quantity. Yet when the defense program was initiated last spring, neither the Defense Commission nor the Army and Navy procurement divisions squarely tackled the machine-tool aspect of their basic problem.

Such, at least, is the opinion of men who know the story from sad experience. These men say there was a threefold failure. First, although the machine-tool industry's capacity was investigated, no comprehensive plan was prepared to increase machine-tool output as rapidly as possible in all plants. Second, no adequate steps were taken to insure the most efficient use of such machine-tool capacity as there was. Instead of allocating machine-tool orders to get the first tools for the most needed weapons, practically every item in the defense program was given an A-1 machine-tool priority rating. And third, no serious effort was made to mobilize all usable existing machine tools for defense purposes. A census of machine-tool resources had been attempted by the Army sometime previously, but when it was found to be highly inaccurate no new census was attempted.

In truth, the problem of obtaining facilities for making finished goods was slighted in favor of the problem of placing orders for the finished goods. Contracts were let to scores and hundreds of manufacturers for scores and hundreds of articles, ranging from Army packs to long-range bombers. The manufacturers rushed to the machine-tool makers, clamoring for the tools they required to carry out their contracts. The machine-tool makers cheerfully booked orders until they could book no more.

Unhappily, the machine-tool makers had been bitten once before, in the first World War, when their business was almost ruined by abnormal expansion. They did not imitate their English brethren, who flatly refused to increase their output in any way until after the Munich crisis. But some tried to handle the rush of business by running three shifts instead of building new plants. Many more agreed to build new plants, but did so very cautiously, trying to avoid any capital investments the new business would not amortize. And thus the total expansion of capacity in the machine-tool industry is even now estimated at not much above 50 percent, and the most optimistic prophets do not promise that capacity will double until spring.

Clearly the result would have been much better if expansion of the machine-tool industry had been directly financed by an appropriate agency—say a machine-tool board of a properly authorized defense commission. Equally clearly, the need for expansion would have been infinitely less acute if an appropriate agency had also attempted to fit all existing machine-tool resources into the defense program.

Not long ago, in this space, a story was told of a small mid-western manufacturer whose plant contained 150 excellent machine tools, yet who could not obtain aircraft subcontracts. It was stated that competent authorities in the Defense Commission believed there were enough similar small plants to avoid the machine-tool bottleneck almost completely. This belief has recently been confirmed by a remarkable survey of the machine-tool resources of the Kansas City area, made by enterprising local businessmen.

Some progress is being made, to be sure, in dealing with the machine-tool problem. An attempt is in progress to convert the motor industry's machine tools for manufacture of aircraft parts, and civilian industries are at least not being permitted to add their orders for new tools to the defense orders now in the machine tool

makers' hands. Yet here again, as elsewhere in the defense program, coordination and planning are the fundamental needs.

Lord Beaverbrook doubled British aircraft output in 3 months, chiefly because he ordered the air manufacturers to subcontract all existing, unused tool capacity, such as that mentioned above. His feat can be repeated here. Meanwhile, expansion of the machine tool makers' plants can also be planned, as they themselves say it needs to be. Unfortunately, these things cannot be done if authority and responsibility are not fixed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 8665. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Lou Davis.

H. R. 10098. An act to amend section 204 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce', approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Thursday, December 26, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2079. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under provisions of the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2080. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize mailing of small firearms to officers and employees of enforcement agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2081. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2082. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2083. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of appropriations of the preceding fiscal year (1940) for the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10736. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution to adjourn sine die; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

9417. Mr. RAMSPECK presented a memorial of the Industrial Insurers' Conference, Atlanta, Ga., calling attention to

the serious problems facing the country, and revowing their allegiance to the United States and the principles for which it stands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has given us Thy only begotten Son to take our nature upon Him, and makest us glad with the yearly remembrance of His birth: Grant us grace, we beseech Thee that we, being made Thy children by adoption and grace, may be filled with the Holy Spirit to guide our lives by His most excellent example; that all hatred and malice, all pride, and uncharitableness may be done away; that in Thy light our Nation and every nation may see light, until sorrow and sighing shall pass away in the joy of Thy everlasting peace. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, December 23, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 4415) to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same, and to provide for the punishment thereof," approved June 25, 1910.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 8665. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Lou Davis; and

H. R. 10098. An act to amend section 204 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce', approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the credentials of JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator for that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of HUGH A. BUTLER, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator for that State for the term beginning January 3, 1941, which were read and ordered to be filed.

AWARDS OF QUANTITY CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two letters from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories thereof entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.